

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11-15 have been amended. Claim 16 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claim 1-15 are currently pending in the present application. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated December 13, 2006 in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,408,128 B1 issued to Abecassis, which describes “capabilities and environments that **automatically** customize the playing of videos to satisfy the particular video requirement of each of a plurality of viewers, and that deliver to each viewer a more enjoyable video experience without requiring the level of active participation inherent in interactive systems, the use of personal computers, and/or by primitive consumer electronic products. (Abecassis column 1 lines 46-53).” It is respectfully submitted that the automatic method of Abecassis is clearly designed such that viewer involvement in creating a customized video presentation is significantly reduced. At the same time, the editing options available to the viewer are substantially limited.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 recites a combination of limitations not taught nor suggested by Abecassis.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to specifically claim that **any** video frame may be selected by the viewer to be manipulated, and that the file storing the manipulated video frame and interest points is **stored after the video frame has been manipulated**. Furthermore, claim 1 now specifically recites that, **“when a DVD player causes a portion of said preexisting digital video title to be displayed on a display coupled to said DVD player, said file causes said DVD player to display the manipulated video frame stored in the file on the DVD in place of the corresponding original video frame from the preexisting digital video title stored on the DVD such that a user is able to examine the one or more interest points in the manipulated video frame, said location of said corresponding original video frame from the preexisting digital video title being specified by the associated identifiers in said file.”** Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, and particularly at page 11, which describes a “z-frame setting area” for use in specifying where a manipulated video frame (z-frame) is to be positioned during display of a portion of a video title. More particularly, the z-frame setting area includes entry fields for specifying a time field 615, a pre-roll time field 620 and a use gamma field 625 (the use gamma field 625 for increasing or

decreasing the brightness of the one or more interest points). Of particular note, page 11 lines 22-23 recite, “The pre-roll time is the amount time that video will be played before the z-frame is paused,” allowing the viewer to then peruse one or more interest points on a manipulated z-frame.

In other words, when one of the preexisting digital video titles is played on a DVD player, the DVD player decompresses a video bitstream from the digital video title and causes a display coupled to the DVD player to display the digital video bitstream in a normal fashion until it reaches a video frame in the title that is identified as having one or more interest points. The identification of the video frame having one or more interest points is made by identifiers stored in a file on the DVD. **Rather that displaying the original video frame, the DVD player causes the display to display a manipulated video frame that is also stored in the file on the DVD.** A viewer may then view the one or more interest points in the manipulated video frame. Sometime thereafter, the DVD player resumes playing the digital video title until a next video frame identified by the file is reached (if any).

According to Abecassis, the viewer simply chooses his preferences from a video preferences list already available on a variable content video, which includes video content categories, and the system automatically chooses video **segments** from the variable content video to match the viewer’s preferences. **Thus, the viewer’s viewing options are limited by the video map produced and provided by the editor of the variable content video.** More particularly, **only** the video frames or segments of video frames chosen by the editor and stored in the video map may be manipulated. Moreover, Abecassis does not disclose or suggest that the DVD player would play the video until an identifier is reached, and then subsequently display a **manipulated video frame in place of an associated original video frame**; rather, Abecassis teaches that the **original video frames of the video segments** to be displayed are displayed all the way through and according to the preferences list defined before the displaying of the video segments.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Abecassis does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in claim 1, and hence, claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Abecassis. Withdraw of the 35 USC 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

A number of the claims were also rejected under Abecassis in view of US 2002/0018136 A1 issued to Kaji et al, which describes an image pickup device including an image processing apparatus “provided with an electronic zooming device for electronically enlarging the image

around a selected position in the image area (See Abstract).” It is respectfully submitted that nothing in Kaji cures the fundamental deficiencies of Abecassis. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that no reasonable combination of Abecassis and Kaji can be used to reconstruct the present invention as defined in the pending claims.

Independent claim 11 recites limitations similar in scope to those recited in claim 1, and is, therefore, respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1.

All dependent claims depend directly or indirectly on the independent claims, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims. Additionally, these dependent claims recited additional elements or limitations that when considered in the context of the present invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. GENSP029).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001